October 1, 1999

Ms. E. Cary Grace
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
Legal Department
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR99-2791

Dear Ms. Grace:

You have asked whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 127693.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for "the written statement taken from your driver Daniel Inocencio," concerning an automobile collision on March 3, 1999, which involved the requestor's client. In response to the request, you submit to this office for review the information at issue. You claim that the requested information is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception and arguments you raise, and have reviewed the information submitted.¹

Section 552.103(a), the "litigation exception" excepts from disclosure information:

- (1) relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature or settlement negotiations, to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party; and
- (2) that the attorney general or the attorney of the political subdivision has determined should be withheld from public inspection.

¹You have also submitted to this office information that apparently was sent for informational purposes only. In this ruling, we do not address the public disclosure of that information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found., 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); Heard v. Houston Post Co., 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). Section 552.103 requires concrete evidence that litigation may ensue. To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the city must furnish evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989).

Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see Open Records Decision No. 518 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Nor does the mere fact that an individual hires an attorney and alleges damages serve to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

In this instance, you have supplied to this office "four separate claim letters and requests for payment of damages," from attorneys and individuals. You state that "a notice of injury and claim has been submitted by an attorney on behalf of a passenger in the ambulance." You have also submitted an affidavit in support of the section 552.103 claim, in which a Senior Assistant Attorney asserts that "the requested information is reasonably related to anticipated litigation." Based on your arguments and the submitted records, we conclude that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996). We also conclude that the information submitted by the city is related to the litigation for the purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the information at issue, submitted as Exhibit 2, may be withheld pursuant to section 552.103(a).

²Under Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), a governmental body may establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated by showing that (1) it has received a claim letter from an allegedly injured party or his attorney, and (2) the governmental body states that the letter complies with the notice of claim provisions of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA") or applicable municipal statute or ordinance.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Sincerely

Sam Haddad

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

SH/nc

Ref.: ID# 127693

Encl: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Stan Gold

Foley & Associates

1301 North Denton, Suite 205

Carrollton, Texas 75006

(w/o enclosures)